

**REMARKS**

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-23 have been pending in the application.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Handel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,195,651).

According to the foregoing, the claims are amended, new claim 24 is added, and, thus the pending claims, including new claim 24, remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

**REJECTIONS**

The Examiner maintains from the previous Office Action the rejection of claims 1-23 as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Handel (US Patent No. 6,195,651).

Further, the Examiner newly rejects claims 1-23 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action page 2 alleges "the subject matter "display condition" and "filtering by the acquired user profile information" was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention."

Further, the Office Action page 2 newly rejects claims 1-23 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. The Office Action page 3 alleges the phrase "display condition" is indefinite; the segment "the additional information" is indefinite; and the feature of "filtering" is indefinite. The Office Action page 3 also alleges "it is not clear how filtering is performed. Further, there appears to be no support for filtering in the specification."

Office Action pages 6-7 is the Response to Arguments, in which the Examiner essentially maintains "Handel discloses selecting products based on customer profile (see fig. 10A and rejection above)."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action and the rejections are traversed, as follows.

The Office Action page 2 alleges “the subject matter ‘display condition’ and ‘filtering by the acquired user profile information’ was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.” As the previous Amendment provided, the present Application FIGS. 4 and 8 and page 14, line 21 to page 19, line 15, and page 18, line 7 to page 19, line 15 expressly describe the claimed present invention’s “***display condition***” and “***filtering, by the acquired user profile information, the additional information database in which the display condition is stored***” to provide “a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention” (35 USC 112, first paragraph), because FIG. 4 expressly shows a table of product names A, B, C, and for each product A, B, C display conditions are provided based upon “recommendation parameter” 1, 2 and 3 of “Age,” “occupation,” and “sex.” In other words, for a product A, if determined that a user’s occupation is “student,” a “recommend” message will be presented for product A.

The present Application page 18, lines 7-10 expressly describes: “the additional information stored in the additional information database 102 may be made display parameters as shown in the table of FIG. 4,” thus providing “a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention” (35 USC 112, first paragraph). Further, the expression “additional information” is definite and meets 35 USC 112, second paragraph, “to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention,” because the claims recite “**additional information for individual product information.**”

Nevertheless, the independent claims 1, 2, 22 and 23, using claim 1 as an example, are amended, taking the Examiner's comments into consideration to clarify the patentably distinguishing features of the present invention, as follows:

1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A product information notification method comprising:

storing, in an additional information database, additional information for individual product information and additional information display parameters of user profile information which is a display condition to display the additional information for a user, in association with individual product information of a product information database;

presenting basic information for the individual product to a user, from the product information database;

acquiring profile information of the user receiving the basic information for the individual product;

~~filtering, by the acquired user profile information, the additional information database in which the display condition is stored;~~

~~selecting, from the additional information database, the additional information that meets, based upon the acquired user profile information, a stored additional information display parameter of the additional information the display condition; and~~

displaying ~~presenting to the user the selected additional information together with the basic information of the individual product.~~

24. (NEW) The product information notification method according to claim 1,

wherein the additional information display parameters comprise one or more of age, occupation, or user sex, and

wherein the additional information is recommendation information.

Handel cannot anticipate the claimed present invention, because Handel fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claimed present invention.

In contrast to Handel, the claimed present invention provides "~~stored~~ ... additional information display parameters of user profile information which is a display condition to display the additional information for a user, in association with individual product information of a product information database."

In contrast to Handel, the claimed present invention provides “selecting, from the additional information database, the additional information that meets, based upon the acquired user profile information, a stored additional information display parameter of the additional information the display condition,” hence, a benefit of filtering or providing targeted additional information to be displayed according to the acquired user profile information even when the user’s profile information changes, or a benefit that a change to the display parameter is immediately reflected as change to the additional information provided to a user.

The Office Action pages 4 and 7 in rejecting independent claim 1 allege “Handel discloses selecting products based on customer profile (see fig. 10A and rejection above).” However, as illustrated in Handel FIG. 10B, at 1002 user’s preferences are acquired from a user profile database 1003 to provide in 1006 a user centric content. In contrast to Handel, the claimed present invention provides **both “additional information display parameters” and “acquired user profile information”** which are compared with each other and beneficially allow displaying targeted additional information even when the user’s profile information changes, or a change to a display parameter is immediately reflected as a change to the additional information provided to a user. See, for example, the present Application page 24, starting at line 17, and page 39, line 14 to page 40, line 11.

The Office Action alleges Handel’s FIG. 10A meets the claimed present invention, because the integrator’s web server 1020 accesses customer profile information 1060 to provide supplier product information 1080 based upon the customer profile 1060. However, Handel fails to disclose or suggest details for any of its databases shown in FIG. 10A, so that Handel fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s “additional information” 3, 102, 401 and “additional information display parameters” 5, 104, 403 (i.e., “storing, in an additional information database, additional information for individual product information and additional information display parameters of user-profile information which is a display condition to display the additional information for a user, in association with individual product information of a product information database”).

Handel cannot anticipate the claimed present invention, because Handel fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claimed present invention, because Handel’s databases fail to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s, “in an additional information database, additional information for individual product information and additional information display parameters of user-profile information which is a display condition to

display the additional information for a user, in association with individual product information of a product information database" and "selecting, from the additional information database, the additional information that meets, based upon the acquired user profile information, a stored additional information display parameter of the additional information the display condition." In other words, Handel does not discuss, either expressly or inherently, "additional information for individual product information and additional information display parameters," and Handel does not discuss either expressly or inherently, "selecting ... additional information that meets, based upon the acquired user profile information, a stored additional information display parameter."

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 14, 2006

By:   
Mehdi D. Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501